

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. In the July 23, 2004 Office Action, claims 1-3, 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,285,494 to Sprecher et al. (hereinafter "*Sprecher*"). Claims 7 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,217 to Bengtsson et al. (hereinafter "*Bengtsson*"). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Bengtsson* in view of *Sprecher*. Claims 8-12, 15, 16, 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Sprecher* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,758 B1 to Almeida et al. (hereinafter "*Almeida*"). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Bengtsson* in view of *Almeida*. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

**Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sprecher*. The applicant has amended independent claim 1 to more clearly depict one aspect of the present invention. *Sprecher* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of amended claim 1. In particular, *Sprecher* does not teach "providing the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device such that the data may be simultaneously viewed, wherein the data comprises cellular site identification information, site specific equipment identification information, revision information, and information for entering a work order" as recited by independent claim 1. *Sprecher* does not teach providing current cellular site data that includes at least the elements of data recited in claim 1, namely "cellular site identification information, site specific equipment identification information, revision information, and information for entering a work order," in one location such that it may be viewed together. In contrast, this aspect of the present invention recited in independent claim 1 is clearly shown in Figure 6 of the present application. For at least this reason, the applicant submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over *Sprecher*.

Independent Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sprecher*. The applicant has amended independent claim 4 to more clearly depict one aspect of the present invention. *Sprecher* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of amended claim 4. In particular, as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Sprecher* does not teach instructions in the memory device in the computer that cause the one or more processors to “provide the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device such that the data may be simultaneously viewed, wherein the data comprises cellular site identification information, site specific equipment identification information, and revision information” as recited by claim 4. For at least this reason, independent claim 4 is allowable over *Sprecher*.

Independent Claim 7

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bengtsson*. The applicant has amended independent claim 7 to more clearly depict one aspect of the present invention. *Bengtsson* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of amended claim 7. In particular, *Bengtsson* fails to teach computer-readable instructions operative to “provide the current cellular telecommunications site data to an output device such that the data may be simultaneously viewed, wherein the data comprises cellular site identification information, revision information, and information for entering a work order” as recited by independent claim 7. For at least the reason that *Bengtsson* fails to teach these recitations, independent claim 7 is allowable over *Bengtsson*.

Independent Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Sprecher* in view of *Almeida*. The applicant has amended independent claim 8 to more clearly depict one aspect of the present invention. *Sprecher* in combination with *Almeida* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of amended claim 8. In particular, the cited art fails to teach “when the cell tab is selected, cellular telecommunications site data is displayed to the user, wherein the data comprises cellular site identification information, site specific equipment identification

information, revision information, and information for entering a work order” as recited by claim 8. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Sprecher* fails to teach displaying together “cellular site identification information, site specific equipment identification information, revision information, and information for entering a work order.” *Almeida* also fails to teach this recitation. Therefore, the applicant submits that combining the teachings of *Sprecher* and *Almeida* would not result in the teachings of amended claim 8. For at least this reason, independent claim 8 is allowable over *Sprecher* in view of *Almeida*.

Dependent Claims 10, 12, 14, and 16

Dependent claims 10, 12, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Sprecher* in view of *Almeida* or *Bengtsson* in view of *Almeida*. The applicant submits that the cited art fails to teach, suggest, or describe grouping cellular site information according to “identification and location information,” “cell face engineering information,” “regulatory information,” “microwave information,” and “report generation” categories for display. *Sprecher* and *Bengtsson* describe presenting limited identification information to a user, but do not describe presenting regulatory or microwave information. Additionally, *Sprecher* and *Bengtsson* fail to describe categorizing the information that is displayed into the above recited categories. *Almeida* describes the use of tabs, but does not describe presenting the specific information in the specific categories recited in dependent claims 10, 12, 14, and 16. For at least these reasons, and because dependent claims 10, 12, 14, and 16 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, dependent claims 10, 12, 14, and 16 are allowable over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-20

Because the prior art of record fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-20, and because claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-20 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-20 are allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC



Date: October 22, 2004

By: Leonard J. Hope  
Reg. No. 44,774

Merchant & Gould  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

